arXiv:1401.4749v2 [math.MG] 4 Jan 2015

Congruence and Metrical Invariants of Zonotopes

Eugene Gover

The defining matrix A of a zonotope $\mathcal{Z}(A) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ determines the zonotope as both the linear image of a cube and the Minkowski sum of line segments specified by the columns of the matrix. A zonotope is also a convex polytope with centrally symmetric faces in all dimensions. When a zonotope is represented by a matrix, its volume is the sum of the absolute values of the maximal-rank minors. Sub-maximal rank minors compute the lower-dimensional volumes of facets. Maximal-rank submatrices determine various tilings of a zonotope, while those of submaximal rank define the angles between facets, normal vectors to facets, and can be used to demonstrate rigidity and uniqueness of a zonotope given various facet-volume and normal-vector data. Some of these properties are known. Others, are new. They will all be presented using defining matrices.

The first section focuses on the central symmetry of faces and facets of convex polytopes, and gives new proofs of theorems of Shephard and McMullen. The second section introduces the Gram matrix A^TA, called the shape matrix of the zonotope, and gives it the central role in a discussion of congruences between zonotopes. The same matrix also plays an important part in the third section where new proofs of theorems of Minkowski and Cauchy-Alexandrov are given in the case of zonotopes.

1. Central Symmetry and Zonotopes

Given $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the points $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $2\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{x}$ will be said to be **symmetric images** of each other with respect to $\boldsymbol{c}$. For a nonempty subset $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the set

$$X_{\boldsymbol{c}} := 2\boldsymbol{c} - X = \{2\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{x} \,|\, \boldsymbol{x} \in X\}$$

will be called the **symmetric image** (or **point reflection**) of X with respect to $\boldsymbol{c}$.

X will be called **centrally symmetric** with **center of symmetry** $\boldsymbol{c}$ if and only if there exists $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $X = X_{\boldsymbol{c}}$, that is, iff X contains the symmetric image of each of its points with respect to a single center $\boldsymbol{c}$. The condition can be restated as saying there exists $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $X = 2\boldsymbol{c} - X$, or such that $X - \boldsymbol{c} = -X + \boldsymbol{c}$, or as the assertion that $\boldsymbol{x} \in X$ iff $2\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{x} \in X$ holds. The center of a bounded centrally symmetric set is unique but need not belong to the set. (If the set is convex, the center will belong to the set.) Another equivalent condition is that X is centrally symmetric if and only if there exists a translation τ such that $\tau(X) = -X$. The center of symmetry will then be $\boldsymbol{c} = \frac{1}{2}\tau^{-1}(\boldsymbol{0})$. In terms of $\boldsymbol{c}$, $\tau(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{x} - 2\boldsymbol{c} = -(2\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{x})$. Central symmetry can also be described using a **symmetric cone** over X centered at $\boldsymbol{c}$, which is defined as the set

$$\operatorname{cone}_{\boldsymbol{c}} X := \{t\boldsymbol{c} + (1-t)\boldsymbol{x} \,|\, \boldsymbol{x} \in X,\, 0 \le t \le 2\}\,.$$

The subset of $\text{cone}_{\boldsymbol{c}} X$ for a single value $t_0 \in [0,2]$ will be denoted

$$\text{cone}_{\boldsymbol{c},t_0} X := \{t_0\boldsymbol{c} + (1-t_0)\boldsymbol{x} \,|\, \boldsymbol{x} \in X\}\,.$$

In particular, $\text{cone}_{\boldsymbol{c},0} X = X$, $\text{cone}_{\boldsymbol{c},1} X = \{\boldsymbol{c}\}$, and $\text{cone}_{\boldsymbol{c},2} X = \{2\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{x} \,|\, \boldsymbol{x} \in X\} = X_{\boldsymbol{c}}$. X will then be centrally symmetric with respect to $\boldsymbol{c}$ iff $\text{cone}_{\boldsymbol{c},0} X = \text{cone}_{\boldsymbol{c},2} X$.

The following properties are easily verified:

Lemma 1.1. *(a)* $(X_{\boldsymbol{c}})_{\boldsymbol{c}} = X$; $(X_{\boldsymbol{c}_1})_{\boldsymbol{c}_2} = 2(\boldsymbol{c}_2 - \boldsymbol{c}_1) + X$; $((X_{\boldsymbol{c}_1})_{\boldsymbol{c}_2})_{\boldsymbol{c}_3} = X_{\boldsymbol{c}_3 - \boldsymbol{c}_2 + \boldsymbol{c}_1}$; $(((X_{\boldsymbol{c}_1})_{\boldsymbol{c}_2})_{\boldsymbol{c}_3})_{\boldsymbol{c}_4} = 2(\boldsymbol{c}_4 - \boldsymbol{c}_3 + \boldsymbol{c}_2 - \boldsymbol{c}_1) + X$, *etc.*
(b) For any $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{cone}_{\boldsymbol{c}} X$ *is centrally symmetric with center of symmetry* $\boldsymbol{c}$.
(c) For any $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $X \cup X_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ *is centrally symmetric with center of symmetry* $\boldsymbol{c}$.
(d) X *is centrally symmetric iff* $X_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ *is centrally symmetric for every* $\boldsymbol{c}$.
(e) X *is centrally symmetric iff for each* $\boldsymbol{c}$ *there exists* $\boldsymbol{v}$ *such that* $X_{\boldsymbol{c}} = \boldsymbol{v} + X$.
(f) If X *and* Y *are each centrally symmetric with respect to the same center* $\boldsymbol{c}$, *then* $X \cap Y$ *and* $X \cup Y$ *are also centrally symmetric with respect to* $\boldsymbol{c}$.

Part (a) says two successive point reflections with the same center leave a set unchanged while using different centers results in translation by twice the difference between the centers. More generally, an odd number of point reflections with centers $\boldsymbol{c}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{c}_{2n+1}$ are equivalent to a single reflection with respect to the alternating sum of the centers; in particular, the image of $\boldsymbol{x} \in X$ will be $2(\boldsymbol{c}_{2n+1} - \cdots + \boldsymbol{c}_1) - \boldsymbol{x} \in X_{(\boldsymbol{c}_{2n+1} - \cdots + \boldsymbol{c}_1)}$. An even number of reflections are equivalent to translation by twice the alternating sum of the centers. Parts (b) and (c) say that the symmetric cone of a set and the union of the set with any point reflection are centrally symmetric. Part (d) says that a set is centrally symmetric if and only if every point reflection is centrally symmetric. Part (e) says X is centrally symmetric iff it can be translated to any and every point reflection image of itself.

Consider a unit cube positioned along the coordinate axes of $\mathbb{R}^k$. Its image in $\mathbb{R}^n$ under a linear transformation defined with respect to the standard bases by a real $n \times k$ matrix A with columns $\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k$ is the set $\mathcal{Z}(A) = \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k) = \{\sum t_i \boldsymbol{a}_i \,|\, 0 \le t_i \le 1\}$. The set will be called the **zonotope** generated by the columns of A, which will in turn be called the **defining matrix** of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$. The **rank** of the zonotope is the rank of its defining matrix. In the special case when $n \ge k$ and the columns are independent (*i.e.*, rank $A = k$), the image is also a **parallelotope** and can be denoted as $\mathcal{P}(A)$ or $\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k)$. The parallelotopes we will consider are generated by the independent columns of tall and thin, or square matrices of rank k with $n \ge k$. They are skewed, stretched, or shrunken images of cubes. The zonotopes that are not parallelotopes will be generated by the dependent columns of matrices of rank r with $r < k$. They are flattened images of cubes.

The **Minkowski sum** of sets of $S_1, \ldots, S_k \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, denoted with the symbol $\oplus$, is the set $S_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus S_k = \{\boldsymbol{s}_1 + \cdots + \boldsymbol{s}_k \,|\, \boldsymbol{s}_i \in S_i\}$. A zonotope is the Minkowski sum of line segments: $\mathcal{Z}(A) = l\boldsymbol{a}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus l\boldsymbol{a}_k$ where the line segment $l\boldsymbol{a}_i = \{t\boldsymbol{a}_i \,|\, 0 \le t \le 1\}$. For a parallelotope, the generators are linearly independent and the Minkowski sum of the corresponding line segments yields a prism whose base is any Minkowski sum leaving out one of the segments. (Note that the parallelotopes we will consider form a proper subset of the polytopes that fill space by translation, which are also called parallelotopes.) Cubes are convex, centrally symmetric, and the convex hulls of finite point sets. It follows that zonotopes, which are their linear images, are also convex, centrally symmetric polytopes. (As polytopes, zonotopes are also finite intersections of half-spaces.) Regarded as Minkowski sums of line segments, zonotopes are centrally symmetric for another reason: for each $\sum_i t_i \boldsymbol{a}_i \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$, there corresponds

$\sum_i (1-t_i)\boldsymbol{a}_i \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$; these two points have center of symmetry $\sum_i \boldsymbol{a}_i/2$, which becomes the center of the entire zonotope.

Suppose zonotope $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ is defined by the matrix $[\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k] \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$ of rank $r \leq k$. A subzonotope of rank $s \leq r$ of the form $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_t})$ to which no further column vectors can be added as generators without increasing the rank will be called a **generating face of dimension** s or an **s-face** of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$. The generators themselves are considered the **generating 0-faces**. A line segment $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_i) = l\boldsymbol{a}_i$ will be a generating 1-face or **edge** unless there is a larger, maximal collection $\boldsymbol{a}_{i_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{i_t}$ of generators containing $\boldsymbol{a}_i$ with each generator a scalar multiple of the others. In that case, $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_{i_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{i_t})$ becomes a generating edge of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ containing each of the $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_i)$'s. A generating $(r-1)$-face will be called a **generating facet**. A rank r subzonotope with exactly r generators will be called a **generating parallelotope** of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$. (The parallelotope will not be a generating r-face unless it is the zonotope itself.)

A **bounding face** is a translate of a generating face to the boundary of the zonotope using sums and differences of generators not used in the definition of that face. For a generating facet $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_t})$, the associated bounding facets can be given explicitly. Consider any $r-1$ linearly independent generators of the facet. For example, suppose $\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_2}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_{r-1}}$ are independent. The cross-product of these generators is then a normal vector to the facet. (See, for example, [4].) We write this as $\boldsymbol{n}_{\mathcal{F}} = \times(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_{r-1}})$. Note that any two sets of $r-1$ independent generators of $\mathcal{F}$ will give cross-products that are scalar multiples of each other. Relabel all generators $\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k$ of the zonotope as $\boldsymbol{a}_1^0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_p^0, \boldsymbol{a}_{p+1}^-, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_q^-, \boldsymbol{a}_{q+1}^+, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k^+$ with superscripts designating the generators with zero, negative, and positive projections on $\boldsymbol{n}_{\mathcal{F}}$. It follows that $\boldsymbol{a}_1^0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_p^0$ is a maximal set of generators of rank $r-1$ with $p = t$ and $\{\boldsymbol{a}_1^0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_p^0\} = \{\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_t}\}$, and that $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1^0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_p^0) + \boldsymbol{a}_{p+1}^- + \cdots + \boldsymbol{a}_q^-$ will be one translation of $\mathcal{F}$ to a bounding facet, while $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1^0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_p^0) + \boldsymbol{a}_{q+1}^+ + \cdots + \boldsymbol{a}_k^+$ will be the corresponding facet on the opposite side of the boundary.

We wish to revisit some results of Shephard and McMullen from [7-10] that examine how the central symmetry of the faces of a zonotope relates to the symmetry of the entire zonotope. As zonotopes in their own right, the faces of a zonotope are always centrally symmetric. For an arbitrary convex polytope, it turns out that the central symmetry of all faces of a given dimension implies the symmetry of the faces of the next higher dimension, while the central symmetry of all faces in any dimension below that of the facets implies the symmetry of the faces of the next lower dimension (McMullen, [7], [8]). Moreover, polytopes whose 2-faces are all centrally symmetric are zonotopes. Consequently, zonotopes may be characterized as the convex polytopes of dimension n whose faces of any one particular dimension k are centrally symmetric, where $2 \leq k \leq n-2$.

In order to establish these and similar results, we start by considering zones of faces of polytopes. Given a k-dimensional face $\mathcal{F}$ of polytope $\mathcal{P}$, the **k-zone** $Z_k(\mathcal{F})$ **induced by** $\mathcal{F}$ is defined as the union of all proper faces that contain translates of $\mathcal{F}$ as faces. It clearly suffices to take the union only of facets, and $Z_k(\mathcal{F})$ satisfies:

$$\textit{if } k < j\textit{, then } Z_k(\mathcal{F}) = \bigcup\{Z_j(\mathcal{F}') \,|\, \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}' \textit{ and } \mathcal{F}' \textit{ is a } j\textit{-face}\}.$$

The 1-zone $Z_1(\mathcal{E}) = Z(\mathcal{E})$ induced by an edge $\mathcal{E}$ is called simply a **zone**. It is the traditional zone that give rise to the name zonotope.

The following is a consequence of Shephard's Theorem 2, from [9].

Lemma 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a convex n-dimensional polytope in $\mathbb{R}^n$ whose faces of dimension $(j+1)$ are all centrally symmetric, where $(j+1)$ is such that $2 \leq (j+1) \leq n$. Consider an orthogonal projection of $\mathbb{R}^n$ to a complement of the j-dimensional affine subspace supporting a*

particular j-dimensional face $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathcal{P}$. Then the image of $\mathcal{P}$ under this projection is an $(n-j)$-dimensional convex polytope, $\pi(\mathcal{P})$, and all faces of $\mathcal{P}$ of dimension j that are translates or point reflection images of $\mathcal{F}$ map in one-to-one fashion to the vertices of $\pi(\mathcal{P})$. For each value k with $j \leq k \leq n$, all k-dimensional faces of $\mathcal{P}$ containing $\mathcal{F}$ are mapped in one-to-one fashion to all $(k-j)$-dimensional faces of $\pi(\mathcal{P})$ containing the image point of $\mathcal{F}$ under the projection.

Using this lemma, it is possible to give a new proof of an n-dimensional version of a theorem of P. Alexandrov different from the proofs given in [3] and [9].

Proposition 1.3. *If all facets of a convex n-polytope ($n > 2$) are centrally symmetric, then the polytope is centrally symmetric.*

Proof. Consider an n-dimensional polytope $\mathcal{P}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\mathcal{F}_1$ be a facet of $\mathcal{P}$ with center of symmetry $\boldsymbol{c}_1$, and let $\mathcal{F}_{1,1}$ be an $(n-2)$-face of $\mathcal{P}$ that is a facet of $\mathcal{F}_1$. Central symmetry ensures that the reflection $(\mathcal{F}_{1,1})_{\boldsymbol{c}_1} = \mathcal{F}_{1,2}$ is the face of $\mathcal{F}_1$ opposite to $\mathcal{F}_{1,1}$. This face is shared with an adjacent facet, $\mathcal{F}_2$. Let $\boldsymbol{c}_2$ be the center of $\mathcal{F}_2$. The reflection $(\mathcal{F}_{1,2})_{\boldsymbol{c}_2} = \mathcal{F}_{1,3}$ is then the face opposite $\mathcal{F}_{1,2}$ on the boundary of $\mathcal{F}_2$. (It is also a translate of $\mathcal{F}_{1,1}$.) Face $\mathcal{F}_{1,3}$ is shared with another facet, $\mathcal{F}_3$. In this way, successive $(n-2)$-faces $\mathcal{F}_{1,1}, \mathcal{F}_{1,2}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{1,m_1+1} = \mathcal{F}_{1,1}$ are determined that are alternately point reflections and translations of $\mathcal{F}_{1,1}$. The faces determine a corresponding chain of facets, $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{m_1+1} = \mathcal{F}_1$, whose union, $\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_{m_1} = Z_{(n-2)}(\mathcal{F}_{1,1})$, is an $(n-2)$-zone on the boundary of $\mathcal{P}$.

Choose an $(n-2)$-face $\mathcal{F}_{2,1}$ adjacent to $\mathcal{F}_{1,1}$ on the boundary of $\mathcal{F}_1$. This determines another sequence of $(n-2)$-dimensional faces, $\mathcal{F}_{2,1}, \mathcal{F}_{2,2}, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_{2,m_2+1} = \mathcal{F}_{2,1}$, consisting of reflected and translated copies of $\mathcal{F}_{2,1}$ and another sequence of facets $\mathcal{F}'_1, \mathcal{F}'_2, \ldots, \mathcal{F}'_{m_2+1} = \mathcal{F}'_1$ whose union is a second $(n-2)$-zone, $Z_{(n-2)}(\mathcal{F}_{2,1})$, on the boundary of $\mathcal{P}$. Project $\mathbb{R}^n$ to the orthogonal complement of the $(n-3)$-dimensional affine subspace supporting the face $\mathcal{F}_{1,2,1} = \mathcal{F}_{1,1} \cap \mathcal{F}_{2,1}$. It follows from Lemma 1.2 that the projections of the two $(n-2)$-zones of facets become zones of 2-faces on the boundary of 3-dimensional $\pi(\mathcal{P})$. Zones on a convex polyhedron are circumferential; any two intersect twice. As the projected zones on $\pi(\mathcal{P})$ both include $\pi(\mathcal{F}_1)$, they must therefore intersect a second time. It follows that the $(n-2)$-zones of preimages must also intersect twice. In other words, if $(n-2)$-zones on the boundary of a convex n-dimensional polytope with centrally symmetric facets intersect at all, then they intersect twice.

The two $(n-2)$-zones under consideration intersect at $\mathcal{F}'_1 = \mathcal{F}_1$. Hence they also intersect at $\mathcal{F}'_j = \mathcal{F}_k$ for some $j, k > 1$. Facet $\mathcal{F}_k$ then includes translative or reflective copies of both $\mathcal{F}_{1,1}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{2,1}$ as part of its boundary. The same is true for $\mathcal{F}_1$. The two facets are therefore parallel. By convexity, $\mathcal{F}_k$ is the unique facet of $\mathcal{P}$ parallel to $\mathcal{F}_1$. Denote it as ${\mathcal{F}_1}^{\text{op}}$. In this way, every facet of $\mathcal{P}$ is paired with a unique parallel, opposite facet. In particular, $\mathcal{P}$ and all zones of facets of $\mathcal{P}$ contain even numbers of facets in parallel, opposite pairs.

We wish to show that $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}}$ are point symmetric images of each other. To see that this is so, let $\boldsymbol{c}_1$ be the center of $\mathcal{F}_1$ and let $\boldsymbol{c}_1^{\text{op}}$ be the center of $\mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}}$. By assumption, $\boldsymbol{c}_1^{\text{op}}$ exists. Set $\boldsymbol{c} = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{c}_1 + \boldsymbol{c}_1^{\text{op}})$. Consider the symmetric image $(\mathcal{F}_1)_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ of $\mathcal{F}_1$, which is a centrally symmetric $(n-1)$-polytope that must lie in the same hyperplane, $\mathcal{H}$, as $\mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}}$. We will see that $(\mathcal{F}_1)_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}}$ are identical. Each can be defined in terms of the intersection of $\mathcal{H}$ with half-spaces determined by the hyperplanes supporting all adjacent facets. Suppose $\mathcal{F}_*$ is a facet of $\mathcal{P}$ adjacent to $\mathcal{F}_1$ with center $\boldsymbol{c}_*$. Then $(\mathcal{F}_*)_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ will be adjacent to $(\mathcal{F}_1)_{\boldsymbol{c}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_*^{\text{op}}$ will be adjacent to $\mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}}$. Denote the hyperplanes supporting $\mathcal{F}_*$, $(\mathcal{F}_*)_{\boldsymbol{c}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_*^{\text{op}}$ by $\mathcal{H}_*$, $(\mathcal{H}_*)_{\boldsymbol{c}}$, and $(\mathcal{H}_*)^{\text{op}}$ respectively. These hyperplanes are parallel, and the latter two contain the center of symmetry $(\boldsymbol{c}_*)_{\boldsymbol{c}} = \boldsymbol{c}_*^{\text{op}}$ common to both $(\mathcal{F}_*)_{\boldsymbol{c}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_*^{\text{op}}$. Hence $(\mathcal{H}_*)_{\boldsymbol{c}} = (\mathcal{H}_*)^{\text{op}}$.

This hyperplane defines two half-spaces one of which contains $\mathcal{F}_*$ and is included among the half-spaces whose intersection with $\mathcal{H}$ defines both $(\mathcal{F}_1)_{\boldsymbol{c}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}}$. The other half-spaces defining the two facets are determined in a similar manner. As a result, $(\mathcal{F}_1)_{\boldsymbol{c}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}}$ have the same definition in terms of intersections, and so $(\mathcal{F}_1)_{\boldsymbol{c}} = \mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}}$. Consequently, $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}}$ are point reflections of each other. $\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}}$ is therefore centrally symmetric with center of symmetry $\boldsymbol{c}_{1,1} := \boldsymbol{c} = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{c}_1 + \boldsymbol{c}_1^{\text{op}})$. The same can then be said for all facets of $\mathcal{P}$.

Thus, for each facet $\mathcal{F}_j$ of $\mathcal{P}$, the union $\mathcal{F}_j \cup \mathcal{F}_j^{\text{op}}$ is centrally symmetric with center of symmetry $\boldsymbol{c}_{j,j} := \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{c}_j + \boldsymbol{c}_j^{\text{op}})$. Moreover, if $\mathcal{F}_j$ and $\mathcal{F}_k$ are adjacent facets sharing an $(n-2)$-face, the centers of symmetry agree on that face making those centers the same: $\boldsymbol{c}_{j,j} = \boldsymbol{c}_{k,k}$. By moving around the entire boundary of $\mathcal{P}$ from facet to adjacent facet, all opposite pairs of facets share a common center of symmetry. This becomes the center of symmetry for the entire polytope, which is therefore centrally symmetric. □

An easy inductive argument then gives the following immediate consequence:

Corollary 1.4. *If the k-dimensional faces of an m-dimensional convex polytope in $\mathbb{R}^n$ are centrally symmetric for some value $k \geq 2$, then the $(k+1)$-dimensional faces are also centrally symmetric.*

Proposition 1.3 and Corollary 1.4 apply when $k \geq 2$. When $k = 1$ and $m = 2$, a convex polygon has 1-dimensional edges that are centrally symmetric, but the polygon itself need not be centrally symmetric. The following conditions show when an arbitrary polygon, or when any closed configuration of line segments, is centrally symmetric.

Proposition 1.5. *A 2-dimensional convex polygon is centrally symmetric if and only if it has an even number of edges and all pairs of opposite edges are parallel and of equal length. More generally, a closed configuration consisting of an even number of directed line segments $\boldsymbol{s}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{s}_{2t} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with the end point of each segment coinciding with the starting point of the next considered modulo $2t$ is centrally symmetric if and only if for each $j = 1, \ldots, t$, $\boldsymbol{s}_j$ and $\boldsymbol{s}_{t+j}$ are parallel, of equal length, and of opposite orientation.*

Proof. For a convex polygon with an even number of edges, if a direction chosen for one edge is used to determine a consistent direction for all successive edges, and if opposite edges are always equal and parallel, then all conditions for a closed configuration of directed line segments given in the statement of the proposition will be satisfied.

Suppose that for such a configuration, $\boldsymbol{s}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{s}_{2t}$, each pair of opposite segments—those of the form $\boldsymbol{s}_j$ and $\boldsymbol{s}_{t+j}$—are parallel, equal, and of opposite orientation. The segments from a pair then determine a parallelogram in the plane they span. Their opposite orientation ensures that one diagonal of the parallelogram will connect the starting points of the segments, and the other diagonal will connect the ending points. The diagonals cross and are divided in halves at the center of the parallelogram. This center and either one of the pair of oppositely oriented segments define a symmetric cone that connects the segments as symmetric images of each other. The diagonals of the parallelogram serve as the extreme, bounding elements of the cone. Symmetric cones of adjacent pairs of segments from the configuration will share one or the other of these bounding diagonal elements, and hence will have the same centers of symmetry. In this way, the centers of symmetry of all opposite pairs of directed segments in the configuration will be the same, and hence the configuration will be centrally symmetric.

Conversely, if the configuration is centrally symmetric, then reflection of any $\boldsymbol{s}_j$ through the center of symmetry will produce the opposite segment $\boldsymbol{s}_{t+j}$, which must then be parallel to $\boldsymbol{s}_j$, of equal length, and with opposite orientation. Consequently, these conditions are equivalent to central symmetry of the configuration. □

Proposition 1.6. *A convex m-polytope in $\mathbb{R}^n$ in which all 2-faces are centrally symmetric is a zonotope.*

Proof. When $m = 2$, consider a centrally symmetric filled-in polygon in the plane. Select any edge of the polygon together with the opposite edge, which is its reflection with respect to the center of symmetry. Connecting the endpoints of the two edges produces a strip in the form of a parallelogram, which by virtue of convexity is wholly contained within the polygon. If the strip is removed, translation by a vector defined by the selected edge joins the endpoints of each removed edge to produce a smaller, centrally symmetric polygon with two fewer edges. The original polygon is the Minkowski sum of the new polygon and the selected edge. By downward induction on the number of edges, the original polygon becomes the Minkowski sum of edges and hence is a zonogon.

Now suppose $m \geq 3$. Assume as an induction hypothesis that the proposition is true for all polytopes of dimension $< m$. Consider an m-dimensional convex polytope $\mathcal{P}$ with centrally symmetric 2-faces. Select an edge $\mathcal{E}$ of $\mathcal{P}$ and let the zone $Z(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_t$ be the union of all facets containing translates of $\mathcal{E}$ as edges. All facets belonging to $Z(\mathcal{E})$ have centrally symmetric 2-faces, so by the induction hypothesis, each is a zonotope containing $\mathcal{E}$ as an edge. Each $\mathcal{F}_j$ therefore decomposes as the Minkowski sum of $\mathcal{E}$ with a smaller zonotope, $\mathcal{F}_j^*$. Thus, $\mathcal{F}_j = \mathcal{F}_j^* \oplus \mathcal{E}$. It follows that

$$Z(\mathcal{E}) \;=\; \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_t = (\mathcal{F}_1^* \oplus \mathcal{E}) \cup (\mathcal{F}_2^* \oplus \mathcal{E}) \cup \cdots \cup (\mathcal{F}_t^* \oplus \mathcal{E}) = (\mathcal{F}_1^* \cup \mathcal{F}_2^* \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_t^*) \oplus \mathcal{E}.$$

(Note that for any subsets $A, B, C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $(A \oplus C) \cup (B \oplus C) = (A \cup B) \oplus C$.) Suppose the remaining facets of $\mathcal{P}$ are $\mathcal{F}_1', \mathcal{F}_2', \ldots, \mathcal{F}_s'$ so that the boundary is $(\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_t) \cup (\mathcal{F}_1' \cup \mathcal{F}_2' \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_s')$. After replacing each $\mathcal{F}_j$ with $\mathcal{F}_j^*$, it follows that

$$(\mathcal{F}_1^* \cup \mathcal{F}_2^* \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_t^*) \cup (\mathcal{F}_1' \cup \mathcal{F}_2' \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_s')$$

is the boundary of a polytope $\mathcal{P}'$ with fewer edges than $\mathcal{P}$, with centrally symmetric 2-faces, and with $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}' \oplus \mathcal{E}$. Once more, by downward induction on the number of non-parallel edges, $\mathcal{P}$ will become the Minkowski sum of edges and hence a zonotope. In this way, every convex polytope of dimension m with centrally symmetric 2-faces will be a zonotope. □

A different proof of Proposition 1.6 can be found in [3, Proposition 2.2.14].

Corollary 1.7. *A convex polytope is a zonotope if and only if it decomposes into zonotopes. Equivalently, a convex polytope is a zonotope if and only if it decomposes into parallelotopes.*

Proof. A zonotope trivially decomposes into zonotopes. By a theorem of Shephard and McMullen (see [4] or [10]), it decomposes into parallelotopes. (Note that the decomposition, also called a **tiling**, means that the zonotope is the union of parallelotopes meeting each other in lower-dimensional facets.)

Conversely, suppose an m-polytope $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ decomposes into zonotopes, and hence into parallelotopes. It follows that in every dimension $< m$, every face of $\mathcal{P}$ also decomposes into parallelotopes. In particular, each 2-face decomposes into (filled-in) parallelograms and each edge decomposes into edges from those parallelograms. Consider a specific 2-face $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathcal{P}$, a particular edge of $\mathcal{F}$, and a parallelogram $\mathcal{P}^2$ that is part of the decomposition of $\mathcal{F}$ and has an edge contained in the designated edge of $\mathcal{F}$. The edge of $\mathcal{P}^2$ opposite to the one lying in the edge of $\mathcal{F}$ is itself shared with another parallelogram in the decomposition of $\mathcal{F}$. By tracking this edge from parallelogram to parallelogram, a strip of parallelograms sharing translated copies of the edge extends across $\mathcal{F}$ to its far side. The process can be repeated with each of the parallelograms that shares an edge with part of the designated edge of $\mathcal{F}$. Taken together, the resulting strips produce a translated copy of the designated edge of $\mathcal{F}$

on the far side of the boundary of $\mathcal{F}$. (A complete edge of $\mathcal{F}$ must be obtained in this way because if part of an edge on the far side was not reached by such a strip of parallelograms, a strip formed in reverse would produce a copy of that part back on the originally designated edge of $\mathcal{F}$.) In this way, every edge of $\mathcal{F}$ is paired with a translated, parallel, opposite copy of that edge. It then follows from Proposition 1.5 that $\mathcal{F}$ is centrally symmetric.

Once all 2-faces are centrally symmetric, the polytope is a zonotope by Proposition 1.6. □

McMullen [7] demonstrated that central symmetry for faces migrates to lower as well as higher dimensions in a convex polytope provided one starts by assuming the central symmetry of faces in a dimension lower than that of the facets. We give McMullen's proof rephrased in the current notation.

Proposition 1.8. *If the $(n-2)$-dimensional faces of n-dimensional convex polytope $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are centrally symmetric, then the $(n-3)$-dimensional faces are centrally symmetric.*

Proof. Consider an $(n-3)$-face, $\mathcal{F}_{1,1,1}$, on the boundary of $(n-2)$-face, $\mathcal{F}_{1,1}$, which is in turn on the boundary of facet, $\mathcal{F}_1$, of $\mathcal{P}$. Central symmetry implies there are $(n-3)$-zones of $(n-2)$-faces on the boundary of $\mathcal{F}_1$ induced by $\mathcal{F}_{1,1,1}$.

If an $(n-3)$-zone of $(n-2)$-faces induced by some $(n-3)$-face is of length four, then the $(n-3)$-face must be centrally symmetric. To see this, suppose $\mathcal{F}_{1,1} \cup \mathcal{F}_{1,2} \cup \mathcal{F}_{1,3} \cup \mathcal{F}_{1,4}$ is a zone of length four induced by $\mathcal{F}_{1,1,1}$. From Proposition 1.3, the facet $\mathcal{F}_1$ is centrally symmetric, so the face opposite $\mathcal{F}_{1,1}$ in this zone satisfies $\mathcal{F}_{1,3} = (\mathcal{F}_{1,1})_{\boldsymbol{c}_1}$ where $\boldsymbol{c}_1$ is the center of $\mathcal{F}_1$. In particular,

$$\mathcal{F}_{1,2} \cap \mathcal{F}_{1,3} = (\mathcal{F}_{1,1,1})_{\boldsymbol{c}_1}.$$

At the same time, central symmetry of $\mathcal{F}_{1,1}$ followed by central symmetry of $\mathcal{F}_{1,2}$ imply by Lemma 1.1(a) that

$$\mathcal{F}_{1,2} \cap \mathcal{F}_{1,3} = 2(\boldsymbol{c}_{1,2} - \boldsymbol{c}_{1,1}) + \mathcal{F}_{1,1,1}.$$

From these two equations, Lemma 1.1(e) implies that $\mathcal{F}_{1,1,1}$ is centrally symmetric.

To complete the proof, it suffices to demonstrate that any $(n-3)$-face such as $\mathcal{F}_{1,1,1}$ must be contained in some $(n-3)$-zone of length four on the boundary of $\mathcal{F}_1$. This can be done by projecting $\mathbb{R}^n$ orthogonally to the complement of the affine $(n-3)$-dimensional subspace containing $\mathcal{F}_{1,1,1}$. The image of $\mathcal{P}$ under this projection is a 3-dimensional centrally symmetric polyhedron with centrally symmetric facets—a zonohedron, $\pi(\mathcal{P})$. Lemma 1.2 guarantees that images of translated and reflected copies of $\mathcal{F}_{1,1,1}$ remain distinct on the boundary of $\pi(\mathcal{P})$ and become its vertices, and that the images of the $(n-2)$-faces containing $\mathcal{F}_{1,1,1}$ become, in one-to-one fashion, the edges on the boundary of $\pi(\mathcal{P})$. The existence of a parallelogram of edges bounding a face of $\pi(\mathcal{P})$ would therefore demonstrate that the preimage is an $(n-3)$-zone of $(n-2)$-faces containing $\mathcal{F}_{1,1,1}$ of length four on the boundary of $\mathcal{F}_1$. But such a parallelogram must exist on the boundary of $\pi(\mathcal{P})$ because any zonohedron contains at least six parallelogram faces, as can be seen using Euler's formula.

In more detail, if $f_j = \#$ faces with j edges and $v_j = \#$ vertices of valency j, then $f = \sum f_j$, $v = \sum v_j$, and $2e = \sum j f_j = \sum j v_j$. Using these values in Euler's formula $v - e + f = 2$ yields two equations,

$$\sum (2-j) f_j + \sum 2 v_j = 4 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum 2 f_j + \sum (2-j) v_j = 4.$$

Combining the first equation with twice the second,

$$\textstyle\sum_{j \geq 3} (6-j) f_j + \sum_{j \geq 3} (6-2j) v_j = 12,$$

from which it follows that

$$3f_3 + 2f_4 + f_5 \geq 12 + \textstyle\sum_{j\geq 7}(j-6)f_j.$$

When all faces are centrally symmetric, $f_3 = f_5 = 0$, so from the preceding inequality, $f_4 \geq 6$. □

Propositions 1.3 and 1.8 can be combined to obtain:

Theorem 1.9. *For a polytope of dimension m in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $m \leq n$, if all j-dimensional faces are centrally symmetric for a particular value, $2 \leq j \leq (m-2)$, then the faces in every dimension, including the polytope itself, are centrally symmetric and the polytope is a zonotope.*

A point made in the proof of Proposition 1.8 is that existence of a k-zone of length $\equiv 0 \bmod 4$ implies that the k-face generating the zone is centrally symmetric. If one considers zones of a specific polytope, the possible lengths for the zones are limited by the nature of the k-faces. For example, the 24-cell $\mathcal{P}_{24} \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ is a regular polytope with twenty four facets, each of which is a regular octahedron. The four pairs of opposite 2-faces of a particular facet give rise to four 2-zones of length $6 \equiv 2 \bmod 4$ on the boundary. No zone can have a length that is a multiple of 4 because the generating 2-face of such a zone would have to be centrally symmetric, which is not the case for the triangular 2-faces of this polytope.

The 2-zones of $\mathcal{P}_{24}$ also provide a discrete Hopf fibration of its boundary. Starting from a particular facet $\mathcal{F}_1$, the four zones of facets generated by opposite pairs of 2-faces of this facet are each of length 6. The zones meet at $\mathcal{F}_1$ and again in their fourth facets, denoted $\mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}}$. The zones can be written as $\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2^j \cup \mathcal{F}_3^j \cup \mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}} \cup \mathcal{F}_5^j \cup \mathcal{F}_6^j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, 4$. Together, these zones account for $(4 \cdot 4) + 2 = 18$ of the facets. The remaining six facets, labeled $\mathcal{F}_1^*, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_6^*$, fill the interstices and complete the boundary of $\mathcal{P}_{24}$. Consider one of the zones, say $\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2^1 \cup \mathcal{F}_3^1 \cup \mathcal{F}_1^{\text{op}} \cup \mathcal{F}_5^1 \cup \mathcal{F}_6^1$. This zone and three new 2-zones $\mathcal{F}_2^2 \cup \mathcal{F}_1^* \cup \mathcal{F}_3^3 \cup \mathcal{F}_5^4 \cup \mathcal{F}_2^* \cup \mathcal{F}_6^3$, $\mathcal{F}_2^3 \cup \mathcal{F}_3^* \cup \mathcal{F}_3^4 \cup \mathcal{F}_5^2 \cup \mathcal{F}_4^* \cup \mathcal{F}_6^4$, and $\mathcal{F}_2^4 \cup \mathcal{F}_5^* \cup \mathcal{F}_3^2 \cup \mathcal{F}_5^3 \cup \mathcal{F}_6^* \cup \mathcal{F}_6^2$ are mutually disjoint. Together, they include all the facets of $\mathcal{P}_{24}$ and constitute a discrete Hopf fibration of the boundary of $\mathcal{P}_{24}$. Other examples with similar fibrations are two more regular polytopes in $\mathbb{R}^4$: the 120-cell, which has regular dodecahedral facets, and the 600-cell, which has tetrahedral facets. Prisms in $\mathbb{R}^4$ also have simple discrete fibrations. This raises the question of whether there might exist sequences of polytopes in $\mathbb{R}^4$ with increasing numbers of 2-zones that allow discrete Hopf fibrations, which in the limit give the fibration of the 3-sphere.

With regard to $(n-2)$-zones—as opposed to 1-zones—on the boundaries of zonotopes, start by considering the 4-cube. One standard 3-dimensional projection of the 4-cube consists of inner and outer cubes whose corresponding vertices are connected by additional edges. The facets in this projection consist of two 3-cubes that can be labeled *inner* and *outer*, and six more 3-cells surrounding the inner cube that can be labeled in pairs as *up/down*, *front/back*, and *left/right*. Two non-intersecting $(n-2) = 2$-zones consisting of the facets *front-down-back-up* and *inner-left-outer-right* then form a decomposition of the boundary of the 4-cube. This is the simplest discrete version of the Hopf fibration $S^1 \hookrightarrow S^3 \to S^2$ for spheres that is realizable for a polytope.

While some $(n-2)$-zones on the boundaries of n-zonotopes might not intersect, an argument given in the course of the proof of Proposition 1.3 establishes

Proposition 1.11. *If two $(n-2)$-zones on the boundary of a zonotope intersect, then they intersect precisely twice.*

2. Congruences of Zonotopes

For the study of congruence, start with an identity that comes from the matrix A^TA, which will be called the **shape matrix** of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$. If two zonotopes have the same shape matrix, they are congruent because the transformation taking generating vectors of one zonotope to corresponding vectors of the other is an isometry. The matrix formulation is the following:

Proposition 2.1. *If A and B are $n \times k$ matrices (n and k arbitrary), then $A^TA = B^TB$ if and only if $B = QA$ where Q is an $n \times n$ orthogonal matrix.*

Proof. We prove only the non-trivial direction and assume $A^TA = B^TB$. Let $A = [\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k]$ and $B = [\boldsymbol{b}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{b}_k]$. Observe first that independence of the columns of A is equivalent to nonsingularity of A^TA. (Independence of the columns and $A^TA\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{0} \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{x}^TA^TA\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{0} \Rightarrow \|A\boldsymbol{x}\|^2 = 0 \Rightarrow A\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{0} \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{0}$. Nonsingularity of A^TA and $A\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{0} \Rightarrow A^TA\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{0} \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{0}$.) The same can be said for B.

Case 1: A has independent columns. By the initial observation, we have independence of the columns of A iff $A^TA = B^TB$ is nonsingular, that is, iff we have independence of the columns of B. Hence $\text{col}(A)^\perp$ and $\text{col}(B)^\perp$ both have dimension $n - k$. Let $\boldsymbol{a}_{k+1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_n$ and $\boldsymbol{b}_{k+1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{b}_n$ be orthonormal bases of $\text{col}(A)^\perp$ and $\text{col}(B)^\perp$ respectively. Let Q be the matrix of the transformation defined by $Q\boldsymbol{a}_i = \boldsymbol{b}_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Thus, in particular, $QA = B$. Clearly, Q is orthogonal on $\text{col}(A)^\perp$. It then remains to be shown that Q is also orthogonal on $\text{col}(A)$. To do so, consider vectors $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in \text{col}(A)$ written as $\boldsymbol{x} = A\boldsymbol{c}$ and $\boldsymbol{y} = A\boldsymbol{d}$. We then have

$$(Q\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot (Q\boldsymbol{y}) = (QA\boldsymbol{c})^T(QA\boldsymbol{d}) = (B\boldsymbol{c})^T(B\boldsymbol{d}) = \boldsymbol{c}^TB^TB\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{c}^TA^TA\boldsymbol{d} = (A\boldsymbol{c})^T(A\boldsymbol{d}) = \boldsymbol{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{y}.$$

Hence Q preserves inner products on $\text{col}(A)$ and is therefore orthogonal.

Case 2: A has dependent columns. Let $A_0 = [\boldsymbol{a}_{i_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{i_l}]$ ($l < k$) where $\boldsymbol{a}_{i_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{i_l}$ is a maximal collection of independent columns of A, and set $B_0 = [\boldsymbol{b}_{i_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{b}_{i_l}]$. The hypothesis $A^TA = B^TB$ implies $A_0^TA_0 = B_0^TB_0$, so from case 1, $B_0 = QA_0$ for some orthogonal Q. We wish to show $B = QA$ and so that $Q\boldsymbol{a}_t = \boldsymbol{b}_t$ for each $t \neq i_1, \ldots, i_l$. By the observation made at the start of the proof, maximal independence of the columns of A_0 implies the same for the columns of B_0. As $\boldsymbol{a}_t$ and $\boldsymbol{b}_t$ are thus dependent on the columns of A_0 and B_0 respectively, we may write $\boldsymbol{a}_t = \sum_{j=1}^{l} c_j\boldsymbol{a}_{i_j} = A_0\boldsymbol{c}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}_t = \sum_{j=1}^{l} d_j\boldsymbol{b}_{i_j} = B_0\boldsymbol{d}$. Meanwhile, $Q\boldsymbol{a}_t = QA_0\boldsymbol{c} = B_0\boldsymbol{c}$. To complete the proof, we must show $\boldsymbol{c} = \boldsymbol{d}$. But this follows from the series of implications:

$$A^TA = B^TB \Rightarrow A_0^T\boldsymbol{a}_t = B_0^T\boldsymbol{b}_t \Rightarrow A_0^TA_0\boldsymbol{c} = B_0^TB_0\boldsymbol{d} = A_0^TA_0\boldsymbol{d} \Rightarrow A_0^TA_0(\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{d}) = \boldsymbol{0} \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{0}.$$

The last implication follows from the nonsingularity of $A_0^TA_0$, which itself follows from yet another application of the initial observation of the proof. □

Applications of this proposition (in the complex case and with a different proof) were given in [6], but no geometric interpretations involving zonotopes were mentioned. Some results from that article take on added significance when the matrices (in the real case) are regarded as shape matrices of zonotopes. The proposition in the form given here together with some of its consequences represent past joint work with Nishan Krikorian. We now extend some of the results that relate to zonotopes.

One piece of information that the shape matrix does not contain is the dimension of the space in which the zonotope resides. What if two such objects have the same shape matrix but lie in different dimensional Euclidean spaces? Then Proposition 2.1 becomes:

If A is $m \times k$ and B is $n \times k$ ($m \leq n$), then $A^TA = B^TB$ iff $B = QA$ where Q is $n \times m$ with orthonormal columns.

This is just a slight generalization whose proof is omitted.

Another piece of geometric information about a zonotope that the shape matrix does not give is its embedding in Euclidean space. So far, congruent zonotopes have implicitly been assumed attached to the origin at vertices that correspond to each other under the congruence. But if that is not the case, such a correspondence can be made after altering the defining matrix of one of the zonotopes in order to change the vertex located at the origin. For example, if $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k)$ is translated along edge $\boldsymbol{a}_1$ so that the origin is moved to the terminal point of that edge, the resulting copy of the zonotope will have the form $-\boldsymbol{a}_1 + \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k) = \mathcal{Z}(-\boldsymbol{a}_1, \boldsymbol{a}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k)$. A sequence of such translations can be used to reach any vertex yielding $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}'_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}'_k)$, which will therefore be related to $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k)$ simply by $\boldsymbol{a}'_i = \pm\boldsymbol{a}_i$. The generating matrices will then be related by $A' = AJ$ and the shape matrices by $(A')^TA' = JA^TAJ$ for some $k \times k$ diagonal matrix J with ± 1's on the principal diagonal. If, in addition, we wish to reorder the generating vectors (to match, for example, the order of generating vectors of some congruent zonotope), this can be done by pre-multiplying A by a permutation matrix, Σ. The general statement about congruence is then:

Theorem 2.2. *$\mathcal{Z}(A)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B)$ are congruent, where A is $m \times k$ and B is $n \times k$ ($m \leq n$), if and only if $(A')^TA' = B^TB$ where $A' = A\Sigma J$ for some $k \times k$ permutation matrix Σ and some diagonal matrix J with ± 1's on the diagonal, or equivalently, if and only if there exists an $n \times m$ matrix Q with orthonormal columns such that $B = QA\Sigma J$.*

Now, consider a pair of generating matrices A and B of size $n \times k$ with independent columns, along with the parallelotopes $\mathcal{P}(A)$ and $\mathcal{P}(B)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and the zonotopes $\mathcal{Z}(A^T)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B^T)$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$. We may think of $\mathcal{P}(A)$ and $\mathcal{P}(B)$ as column-parallelotopes, and refer to $\mathcal{Z}(A^T)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B^T)$—which are defined using the columns of A^T and B^T—as the corresponding row-zonotopes (of A and B). We ask for conditions under which congruence of one pair of objects, coming from equality of the corresponding shape matrices, implies congruence of the other pair and how these conditions relate to the congruences. For example,

$$A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix},\ B_1 = \sqrt{2}\begin{bmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 2 & -1 \end{bmatrix};\ A_2 = \tfrac{1}{13}\begin{bmatrix} 3 & -12 \\ 4 & -3 \\ 12 & 4 \end{bmatrix},\ B_2 = \tfrac{\sqrt{2}}{26}\begin{bmatrix} 15 & -9 \\ 7 & 1 \\ 8 & 16 \end{bmatrix};$$

$$A_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix},\ B_3 = \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{884}}\begin{bmatrix} 46 & 48 \\ 82 & 124 \end{bmatrix};\ A_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 26 & 8 \\ 24 & 2 \\ 18 & -16 \\ 32 & 26 \end{bmatrix},\ B_4 = \sqrt{2}\begin{bmatrix} 17 & 9 \\ 13 & 11 \\ 1 & 17 \\ 29 & 3 \end{bmatrix},$$

are four pairs of matrices where both $(A_i)^TA_i = (B_i)^TB_i$ and $A_i(A_i)^T = B_i(B_i)^T$. In other words, $\mathcal{P}(A_i)$ is congruent to $\mathcal{P}(B_i)$ and $\mathcal{Z}((A_i)^T)$ is congruent to $\mathcal{Z}((B_i)^T)$.

Start by considering the case where $n = k$ and all four objects are n-parallelotopes in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Consider the shape matrix A^TA of column-parallelotope $\mathcal{P}(A)$ and shape matrix AA^T of the corresponding row-parallelotope $\mathcal{P}(A^T)$. Another matrix, $A^2 = AA = (A^T)^TA$, can now be thought of as the **comparison matrix** between the generating vectors of the row-parallelotope and the column-parallelotope. It seems plausible to conjecture that if matrices A and B have equal comparison matrices ($A^2 = B^2$), the shape matrices of the row-parallelotopes will be the same ($AA^T = BB^T$) if and only if the shape matrices of the column-parallelotopes are the same ($A^TA = B^TB$). This is in fact true.

Corollary 2.3. *If A and B are square nonsingular matrices, and if $A^2 = B^2$, then $AA^T = BB^T$ if and only if $A^TA = B^TB$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove one of the implications, say$\Leftarrow$. Suppose $A^TA = B^TB$. From Proposition 2.1 it then follows that $B = QA$, or $A = Q^TB$. Therefore, $AQ^TB = AA = BB$, which because B is nonsingular implies $AQ^T = B$, and so $AA^T = AQ^T(AQ^T)^T = BB^T$. □

Corollary 8.1 of [6] gives this same result in complex form but makes no reference to the geometric interpretation involving row and column-parallelotopes.

Another reasonable geometric conjecture is that if A and B have congruent row-parallelotopes ($AA^T = BB^T$) and congruent column-parallelotopes ($A^TA = B^TB$), then their comparison matrices are identical ($A^2 = B^2$) if and only if the two congruences (provided by the matrix Q) are identical. This too is true.

Corollary 2.4. *Let A and B be square nonsingular matrices such that $AA^T = BB^T$ and $A^TA = B^TB$. Then $A^2 = B^2$ iff there exists an orthogonal matrix Q such that $B = QA$ and $B^T = QA^T$.*

Proof. Only $\Rightarrow$ is proved as $\Leftarrow$ is trivial. From Proposition 2.1, $B = Q_1A$ and $B^T = Q_2A^T$. We must show that $Q_1 = Q_2$. Meanwhile, $A^2 = B^2$ can be restated as $BA^{-1} = B^{-1}A$. From the first and last of these several equalities, $Q_1 = BA^{-1} = B^{-1}A$. The second equality may also be rewritten as $B = A(Q_2)^T = A(Q_2)^{-1}$, implying $Q_2 = B^{-1}A$. Thus, $Q_1 = B^{-1}A = Q_2$, as was required. □

When there is no orthogonal Q such that $B = QA$ and $B^T = QA^T$ both hold, it is possible to have (1) $A^TA = B^TB$ and (2) $AA^T = BB^T$, but $A^2 \neq B^2$. This happens, for example, in the case of the third pair of matrices given above. In this situation the condition $A^2 = B^2$ will be replaced with a weaker comparison condition that does hold whenever (1) and (2) hold and therefore seems more closely tied to these two conditions. Indeed, whenever any two of (1), (2), and the new condition hold, it will turn out that the third holds as well. Moreover, the condition will be defined and the implications will hold in the more general setting of rectangular $n \times k$ matrices A and B with independent columns. In that case, the column-parallelotopes $\mathcal{P}(A)$ and $\mathcal{P}(B)$ will reside in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (with $n \geq k$) while the row-zonotopes $\mathcal{Z}(A^T)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B^T)$ belong to $\mathbb{R}^k$. In order to obtain comparison matrices in this setting, the parallelotopes $\mathcal{P}(A)$ and $\mathcal{P}(B)$ are moved to congruent copies $\mathcal{P}(R)$ and $\mathcal{P}(S)$ within $\mathbb{R}^k$ by taking QR-decompositions $A = PR$ and $B = QS$ where P and Q are $n \times k$ matrices with orthonormal columns, and R and S are $k \times k$ upper triangular of rank k. By Theorem 2.2, $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is indeed congruent to $\mathcal{P}(R) \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\mathcal{P}(B)$ is congruent to $\mathcal{P}(S) \subset \mathbb{R}^k$. The parallelotopes in $\mathbb{R}^k$ can now be compared to the corresponding row-zonotopes $\mathcal{Z}(A^T)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B^T)$.

In order to make the comparison between $\mathcal{Z}(A^T)$ and $\mathcal{P}(R)$, and between $\mathcal{Z}(B^T)$ and $\mathcal{P}(S)$, it does not suffice to use AR and BS. There are cases where (1) and (2) hold but $AR = BS$ does not. An example is the pair A_4 and B_4 given above. In order to make valid comparisons with the corresponding zonotopes, each parallelotope must be allowed to independently reorient itself with respect to its zonotope. For this purpose, additional orthogonal matrices Q_1 and Q_2 are introduced so that $\mathcal{Z}(A^T)$ is compared with $\mathcal{P}(Q_1R)$ using the matrix AQ_1R, and $\mathcal{Z}(B^T)$ is compared with $\mathcal{P}(Q_2S)$ using BQ_2S. Now everything works. Setting

$$AQ_1R = BQ_2S, \tag{3}$$

it turns out that when any two of (1), (2), and the new condition (3) hold, then so does the third. The precise relationship of Q_1 and Q_2 to A, R, Q, and S will be clarified in the proof of Proposition 2.6, below. The following lemma will be used to establish the result.

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose R and S are non-singular $k \times k$ upper triangular matrices with $R^T R = S^T S$. Then there is a diagonal matrix J with ± 1's on the diagonal such that $R = JS$.*

Proof. We compute the first two rows of R and S. A straightforward induction (omitted) then completes the proof.

Let the columns of R be $\boldsymbol{r}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{r}_k$ and those of S be $\boldsymbol{s}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{s}_k$. Let m_{ij} be the ij^{th} entry of $R^T R = S^T S$. Then

$$(r_{11})^2 = \boldsymbol{r}_1^T \boldsymbol{r}_1 = m_{11} = \boldsymbol{s}_1^T \boldsymbol{s}_1 = (s_{11})^2,$$

from which $r_{11} = \pm s_{11}$. In addition, for each $j = 2, \ldots, k$,

$$r_{11} r_{1j} = \boldsymbol{r}_1^T \boldsymbol{r}_j = m_{1j} = \boldsymbol{s}_1^T \boldsymbol{s}_j = s_{11} s_{1j}\,.$$

If $r_{11} = s_{11}$, then $r_{1j} = s_{1j}$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$ making the first rows of R and S identical. If $r_{11} = -s_{11}$, then $r_{1j} = -s_{1j}$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$, so the first row of R is the negative of the first row of S.

Next, consider

$$(r_{12})^2 + (r_{22})^2 = \boldsymbol{r}_2^T \boldsymbol{r}_2 = m_{22} = \boldsymbol{s}_2^T \boldsymbol{s}_2 = (s_{12})^2 + (s_{22})^2\,.$$

We have already seen that $(r_{1j})^2 = (s_{1j})^2$ for every j including $j = 2$. It follows that $(r_{22})^2 = (s_{22})^2$, or $r_{22} = \pm s_{22}$. Meanwhile, for each $j = 3, \ldots, k$,

$$\underbrace{r_{12} r_{1j}}_{= s_{12} s_{1j}} + r_{22} r_{2j} = \boldsymbol{r}_2^T \boldsymbol{r}_j = m_{2j} = \boldsymbol{s}_2^T \boldsymbol{s}_j = s_{12} s_{1j} + s_{22} s_{2j}$$

and so $r_{22} r_{2j} = s_{22} s_{2j}$. Consequently, either $r_{2j} = s_{2j}$ for every $j = 2, \ldots, k$, or else $r_{2j} = -s_{2j}$ for every $j = 2, \ldots, k$. Therefore, the second rows of R and S are either identical or negatives of each other. Continuing with similar computations, induction shows that each row of R is either the same or the negative of the corresponding row of S. It follows that $R = JS$ as asserted. □

From the lemma, if $A = QR = Q'R'$ are two QR-decompositions of an $n \times k$ matrix A with independent columns, then $R' = JR$ and $Q' = A(R')^{-1} = AR^{-1}J = QJ$. In other words, the QR-decomposition of A is unique up to a diagonal $k \times k$ matrix J with ± 1's on the diagonal (which changes the signs of specified columns of Q and the corresponding rows of R).

Proposition 2.6. *Let $A = PR$ and $B = QS$ be $n \times k$ matrices with independent columns and QR-decompositions as indicated. Consider the three conditions:*

(1) $A^T A = B^T B$,

(2) $AA^T = BB^T$, *and*

(3) *there exist orthogonal matrices Q_1 and Q_2 such that $AQ_1 R = BQ_2 S$.*

If any two of the conditions hold, then so does the third. On the other hand, no one of these conditions implies either of the other two.

Proof. (*a*) Suppose (3) and $A^T A = B^T B$ hold. It follows that $R^T R = S^T S$, so by Lemma 2.5, $R = JS$ (or $RS^{-1} = J$) for some diagonal matrix J with ± 1's on the diagonal. Condition (3) then reduces to $B = AQ_1 JQ_2^T$, or $B^T = Q_2 JQ_1^T A^T = Q'A^T$ where $Q' = Q_2 JQ_1^T$ is orthogonal, from which it follows that $BB^T = AA^T$.

(*b*) Suppose (3) and $AA^T = BB^T$ hold. From (3), it follows that $B = AQ_1RS^{-1}Q_2^T$. Substituting the second equality in the first and simplifying, $R^TR = S^TS$. Once again, Lemma 2.5 implies $S = JR$ for a diagonal J with ± 1's on the diagonal, so

$$A^TA = R^TR = R^TJJR = S^TS = B^TB.$$

(*c*) Finally, suppose conditions (1) and (2) hold. Then, $A^TA = B^TB$ implies $R^TR = S^TS$, so by Proposition 2.1 there exists an orthogonal Q_1 such that $S = Q_1R$. At the same time, applying Proposition 2.1 to $AA^T = BB^T$ guarantees existence of an orthogonal Q_2 such that $B^T = Q_2A^T$. This last may be rewritten as $A = BQ_2$. It then follows that

$$AQ_1R = AS = BQ_2S.$$

As for the last assertion of the proposition, it is clear that neither (1) nor (2) by itself implies either of the remaining two conditions. Giving an example where (3) holds but the other conditions do not will complete the proof. To that end, let $A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 6 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $B = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$. Then $A^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 6 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = B^2$, but $A^TA \neq B^TB$ and $AA^T \neq BB^T$. Meanwhile, QR-decompositions for A and B may be taken as $A = PR = IA$ and $B = QS = IB$. Also choosing $Q_1 = Q_2 = I$ then leads to $AQ_1R = A^2 = B^2 = BQ_2S$, so (3) holds while (1) and (2) do not. □

We make several observations concerning the proposition. First, the conclusion of the proposition may be rephrased as:

The pairs of conditions—(1)+(3), (2)+(3), *and* (1)+(2)—*are equivalent; but no one condition*—(1), (2), *or* (3)—*implies either of the other two.*

Second, if A and B are square matrices with QR-decompositions $A = PR$ and $B = QS$, and if condition (3) holds with $Q_1 = P$ and $Q_2 = Q$, then condition (3) becomes $A^2 = B^2$. When this version of the condition holds, Proposition 2.6 includes Corollary 2.3 and so is a generalization of that corollary.

Third, as (3) must hold whenever (1) and (2) hold, the simultaneous occurrence of congruences for both the column-parallelotopes and the row-zonotopes ensures that $P(RQ_1R) = Q(SQ_2S)$. This implies that the column spaces of P and Q are the same and forces the column-parallelotopes $\mathcal{P}(A)$ and $\mathcal{P}(B)$ to lie in the same k-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Fourth, denoting the rows of A and B as $\boldsymbol{a}^1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}^n$ and $\boldsymbol{b}^1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{b}^n$ respectively, and writing R and S in terms of their columns as $R = [\boldsymbol{r}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{r}_k]$ and $S = [\boldsymbol{s}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{s}_k]$, condition (3) becomes $\boldsymbol{a}^i \cdot Q_1(\boldsymbol{r}_j) = \boldsymbol{b}^i \cdot Q_2(\boldsymbol{s}_j)$ for every pair (i, j). With (2) and (1) also holding, $\|\boldsymbol{a}^i\| = \|\boldsymbol{b}^i\|$ and $\|Q_1(\boldsymbol{r}_j)\| = \|Q_2(\boldsymbol{s}_j)\|$. Comparison condition (3) then says that all corresponding angles between the pairs $(\boldsymbol{a}^i, Q_1(\boldsymbol{r}_j))$ and $\big(\boldsymbol{b}^i, Q_2(\boldsymbol{s}_j)\big)$ are equal. (These are the angles between the respective pairs of edges from the row-zonotope $\mathcal{Z}(A^T)$ and reoriented column-parallelotope $\mathcal{P}(Q_1(R))$ on the one hand, and $\mathcal{Z}(B^T)$ and $\mathcal{P}(Q_2(S))$ on the other.)

QR-decompositions of $n \times k$ matrices with independent columns, such as A and B with $A = PR$ and $B = QS$, produce "generic" parallelotopes $\mathcal{P}(R)$ and $\mathcal{P}(S)$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$, independent of n. If the additional requirement is imposed on either R or S that the entries on its principal diagonal be positive, then that upper-triangular matrix is uniquely determined. It represents a "template" parallelotope from which all other congruent copies in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of that given shape of parallelotope can be obtained by mapping using Q-type $n \times k$ matrices with k orthonormal columns into appropriate k-dimensional subspaces of Euclidean n-space $\mathbb{R}^n$. A template parallelotope is a k-parallelotope in $\mathbb{R}^k$ in "standard position" meaning that the

j-face defined by the first j columns of the matrix—or by the j corresponding edges of the parallelotope—always lies in the subspace spanned by the first j standard basis vectors of the ambient space. The requirement that the diagonal entries of the triangular matrix be positive implies, in addition, that there exists a half-space such that the parallelotope and all of the standard basis vectors $\boldsymbol{e}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{e}_n$ are contained within that half-space.

Proposition 2.7. *Suppose A and B are $n \times k$ matrices with independent columns, Q' is $m \times n$ with orthonormal columns, $A' = Q'A$, and $B' = Q'B$. Then conditions* (1) *and* (2) *from Proposition 2.6 hold for A and B if and only if the same conditions hold for A' and B'.*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$: Suppose conditions (1) and (2) hold for A and B. Then

$$A'^{\,T}A' = A^TQ'^{\,T}Q'A = A^TA = B^TB = B^TQ'^{\,T}Q'B = B'^{\,T}B'$$

and

$$A'A'^{\,T} = Q'AA^TQ'^{\,T} = Q'BB^TQ'^{\,T} = B'B'^{\,T}.$$

$\Leftarrow$ Suppose conditions (1) and (2) hold for A' and B'. Then

$$A^TA = A^TQ'^{\,T}Q'A = A'^{\,T}A' = B'^{\,T}B' = B^TQ'^{\,T}Q'B = B^TB,$$

and

$$AA^T = Q'^{\,T}A'A'^{\,T}Q' = Q'^{\,T}B'B'^{\,T}Q' = BB^T.$$

□

3. Volumes, Normal Vectors, and Rigidity of Zonotopes

Symmetric cones, which were introduced in Section 1, can be used to derive a well-known volume formula for zonotopes in a new way.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ be an n-dimensional zonotope in $\mathbb{R}^n$ defined by an $n \times k$ matrix $A = [\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k]$ of rank n where the $\boldsymbol{a}_j$'s are the columns of A. Then*

$$\mathrm{vol}_n\left(\mathcal{Z}(A)\right) \;=\; \sum_{1 \le j_1 < \cdots < j_n \le k} \left|\det\left(A^{j_1,\ldots,j_n}\right)\right|$$

where $A^{j_1,\ldots,j_n} \;=\; [\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_n}]$.

Proof. Central symmetry and convexity ensure that the zonotope decomposes completely into symmetric cones defined by pairs of opposite facets:

$$\mathcal{Z}(A) = \bigcup_{1 \le j_1 < \cdots < j_{n-1} \le k} \{\mathrm{cone}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathcal{F}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}})\}$$

where $\boldsymbol{c} = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{a}_1 + \cdots + \boldsymbol{a}_k)$ is the center of symmetry of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ and the facet $\mathcal{F}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}}$ is one of a pair of translated copies of a generating facet defined by the $n \times (n-1)$ submatrix $A^{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}}$. The generating facet is a zonotope of the form $\mathcal{Z}(A^{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}}) = \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_{n-1}})$. In degenerate cases, several such translated zonotopes might lie in the same hyperplane to form actual facets of the given zonotope that are larger than parallelotopes, but this has no effect on the computation of volume. For each submatrix of rank $n-1$, the normalized cross-product provides a unit normal vector for the corresponding non-degenerate facet:

$$\boldsymbol{n}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}} \;=\; \frac{\times(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_{n-1}})}{|\times(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_{n-1}})|} \;=\; \frac{\times(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_{n-1}})}{\mathrm{vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{F}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}})}.$$

(Details about volumes defined by cross-products can be found, for example, in [4].) The n-volume of each symmetric cone is $\frac{1}{n}$ times the $(n-1)$-volume of one of its antipodal bases

times the height, where the height is the distance between the pair of opposite bases of the cone. That distance is simply the sum of the magnitudes of the projections of all $\boldsymbol{a}_j$'s onto $\boldsymbol{n}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}}$. The magnitude of each projection is of the form

$$\left|\boldsymbol{n}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}} \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_j\right| \;=\; \left|\frac{\times\left(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1},\ldots,\boldsymbol{a}_{j_{n-1}}\right)}{\mathrm{vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{F}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}})} \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_j\right| \;=\; \frac{\left|\det\left(A^{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1},j}\right)\right|}{\mathrm{vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{F}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}})}$$

where the second equality is obtained from the Laplace expansion of the determinant in its right-most column. The height is therefore

$$\sum_{j\neq j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}} \frac{\left|\det(A^{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1},j})\right|}{\mathrm{vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{F}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}})}$$

and the n-volume of the symmetric cone is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{vol}_n\left(\mathrm{cone}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathcal{F}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}})\right) \;&=\; \frac{1}{n}\,\mathrm{vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{F}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}}) \;\cdot \sum_{j\neq j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}} \frac{\left|\det(A^{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1},j})\right|}{\mathrm{vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{F}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}})} \\ &=\; \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j\neq j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}} \left|\det(A^{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1},j})\right|.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{vol}_n\left(\mathcal{Z}(A)\right) \;&=\; \sum_{1\le j_1<\cdots<j_{n-1}\le k} \mathrm{vol}_n\left(\mathrm{cone}_{\boldsymbol{c}}(\mathcal{F}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}})\right) \\ &=\; \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\substack{1\le j_1<\cdots<j_{n-1}\le k \\ j\neq j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}}} \left|\det\left(A^{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1},j}\right)\right| \\ &=\; \sum_{1\le j_1<\cdots<j_n\le k} \left|\det\left(A^{j_1,\ldots,j_n}\right)\right|.\end{aligned}$$

The last displayed equality holds because each term $\left|\det\left(A^{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1},j}\right)\right|$ on the next-to-last line occurs n times in equivalent forms within that sum. □

The volume formula also follows from the (non-unique) tiling of a zonotope into translated copies of its generating parallelotopes, each used exactly once. This decomposition was cited in the proof of Corollary 1.7.

Proposition 3.2. *Every n-dimensional zonotope formed from k generating vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$ decomposes into single translated copies of each of its generating parallelotopes. These intersect each other only in lower-dimensional faces and together form a tiling of the zonotope by $\binom{k}{n}$ parallelotopes.*

Proof. A one-dimensional zonotope (line segment) decomposes into subsegments that are translations of all of its generating line segments. And in all dimensions, parallelotopes decompose trivially as themselves. Hence the proposition is true for all zonotopes of dimension 1 and for zonotopes with $k = n$ generators in any dimension n. Assume by induction that a decomposition of the required type exists for all zonotopes in every dimension $< n$ as well as for zonotopes with fewer than $k > n$ generators in dimenison

n. Since $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ is n-dimensional, at least one of its subzonotopes generated by $k-1$ column vectors is also n-dimensional. Thus, we may suppose without loss of generality that $\mathcal{Z}(A) = \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k) = \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{k-1}) \oplus \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_k)$ where the first summand is already n-dimensional.

Assume for now that none of the other generators lie in the 1-dimensional subspace spanned by $\boldsymbol{a}_k$. The visible surface of $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{k-1})$ in the direction of $\boldsymbol{a}_k$ consists (by Lemma 3.2 of [4]) of unique translates of all of the generating facets of the zonotope. Each facet is defined by fewer than k generators so by the induction assumption, each decomposes into unique copies of its $(n-1)$-dimensional generating parallelotopes. Forming the Minkowski sum with $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_k)$ has the effect of adding to $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{k-1})$ a zone of facets that all contain a translated copy of $\boldsymbol{a}_k$, and a new visible surface that is a copy of the old one translated by $\boldsymbol{a}_k$. It is always possible to fill the space between the original and translated copies of the visible surface with n-parallelotopes whose bases are the $(n-1)$-dimensional parallelotopes from the decompositions of the facets of the visible surface and whose remaining generating edge is, in every case, $\boldsymbol{a}_k$. Thus, in addition to the $\binom{k-1}{n}$ parallelotopes in the decomposition of $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{k-1})$, which exist by the induction assumption, there are $\binom{k-1}{n-1}$ parallelotopes of the type just described, for a total of $\binom{k}{n}$ parallelotopes that together form a decomposition of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ of the required type.

In the case where several generators $\boldsymbol{a}_{j+1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k$ all lie in a single 1-dimensional subspace, convexity of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ forces the edges defined by these generators to be contiguous. The sum of these generators then replaces $\boldsymbol{a}_k$ in the previous description. As a result, $(k-j) \cdot \binom{j}{n-1}$ distinct n-dimensional parallelotopes are created where the bases are $(n-1)$-dimensional parallelotopes from the visible surface and the remaining generator is in turn $\boldsymbol{a}_{j+1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k$. □

The parallelotopes from the preceding proof that contain edge $\boldsymbol{a}_k$ are sandwiched between the visible surface of $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{k-1})$ in the direction of $\boldsymbol{a}_k$ and its translated copy by $\boldsymbol{a}_k$. Their union defines a partial shell of parallelotopes forming an "exterior wall" of zonotope $\mathcal{Z}(A) = \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k)$, which Shephard [10] called a **cup of cubes**. Labeling this as $\mathcal{C}_{1,\ldots k-1}(\boldsymbol{a}_k)$, we have the decomposition $\mathcal{Z}(A) = \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{k-1}) \bigcup \mathcal{C}_{1,\ldots,k-1}(\boldsymbol{a}_k)$. A similar decomposition of the smaller zonotope yields

$$\mathcal{Z}(A) = \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{k-2}) \bigcup \mathcal{C}_{1,\ldots,k-2}(\boldsymbol{a}_{k-1}) \bigcup \mathcal{C}_{1,\ldots,k-1}(\boldsymbol{a}_k).$$

More generally,

$$\mathcal{Z}(A) = \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_n}) \bigcup \mathcal{C}_{j_1,\ldots,j_n}(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_{n+1}}) \bigcup \cdots \bigcup \mathcal{C}_{j_1,\cdots,j_{k-1}}(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_k})$$

where $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_n})$ is a generating parallelotope of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{j_1,\cdots,j_l}(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_{l+1}})$ denotes the cup of cubes of $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_l})$ in $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_{l+1}})$ defined by $\boldsymbol{a}_{j_{l+1}}$. Thus, when $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ is developed as the Minkowski sum of successive line segments, various decompositions of the intermediate zonotopes in the manner just shown produce different decompositions of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ in terms of generating parallelotopes. These decompositions, however, do not lead to all possible tilings of the zonotope. (See Shephard [10].)

To illustrate one possibility of what might happen to the facets and tiling of a zonotope, consider

$$A_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_\epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \epsilon & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The first three columns of A_0 are dependent while the other triples of columns are independent. In A_ϵ for small non-zero ϵ, all ten triples of columns are independent. Consequently, only nine out of ten possible choices give generating parallelotopes of $\mathcal{Z}(A_0)$ while for $\mathcal{Z}(A_\epsilon)$, all ten are parallelotopes. In each case, translates of the generating parallelotopes can be arranged in various ways to form a tiling of the zonotope. The generating subzonotope defined by the first three columns of A_0 is two-dimensional and translates to a pair of symmetrically opposite hexagonal facets of the zonotope. Each of these facets coincides with a union of translations of the three generating facets $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \boldsymbol{a}_2)$, $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \boldsymbol{a}_3)$, and $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_2, \boldsymbol{a}_3)$, where $\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_5$ are the columns of A_0. Zonotope $\mathcal{Z}(A_0)$ has $2\binom{5}{2} = 20$ generating facets but only 14 geometric facets; translates of three generating facets make up each hexagonal facet. In the case of $\mathcal{Z}(A_\epsilon)$, denote the columns of A_ϵ by $\boldsymbol{a}'_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}'_5$. Letting $\epsilon \to 0$ demonstrates how a translate of the generating parallelotope $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}'_1, \boldsymbol{a}'_2, \boldsymbol{a}'_3)$ flattens out and approaches one of the two hexagonal facets on the boundary of $\mathcal{Z}(A_0)$. Which facet is approached depends on the choice of tiling. At the same time, two different sets of translates of the generating facets $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}'_1, \boldsymbol{a}'_2)$, $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}'_1, \boldsymbol{a}'_3)$, and $\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}'_2, \boldsymbol{a}'_3)$ approach co-planarity on opposite sides of the boundary of the zonotope to form copies of that same hexagonal facet.

Angles between edges $l\boldsymbol{a}_i$ and $l\boldsymbol{a}_j$ of an n-zonotope $\mathcal{Z}(A) = \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k)$ can be computed as $\theta = \arccos(\boldsymbol{a}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_j / |\boldsymbol{a}_i|\,|\boldsymbol{a}_j|)$. Dihedral angles between facets can be computed similarly using normal vectors to the facets. For facet $\mathcal{Z}(A^{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}}) = \mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_{n-1}})$, the unit normal vector is

$$\boldsymbol{n}_{j_1,\ldots,j_{n-1}} = \frac{\times(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_{n-1}})}{|\times(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_{n-1}})|} = \frac{\times(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_{n-1}})}{\mathrm{vol}_{n-1}(\mathcal{Z}(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_{j_{n-1}}))}.$$

The cross-product used to find this normal vector can also be recovered from $\wedge^{n-1}(A)$, the matrix representing the map $\wedge^{n-1} f : \wedge^{n-1}\mathbb{R}^k \to \wedge^{n-1}\mathbb{R}^n$ with respect to reverse lexicographically ordered bases of the exterior powers $\wedge^{n-1}\mathbb{R}^k$ and $\wedge^{n-1}\mathbb{R}^n$. The entries of $\wedge^{n-1}(A)$ are the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ minors of A, with the minor in row i and column j the one defined by omitting those row and column indices. If $\wedge^{n-1}(A)$ is modified so that its rows and columns alternate in sign with the (i,j)-th entry multiplied by $(-1)^{n+i+j}$, then the j-th column of the new matrix $\wedge^{n-1}_{\pm}(A)$ will be the cross product (or its negative) of the columns of A with the complementary column indices. That is,

$$\left(\wedge^{n-1}_{\pm}(A)\right)^j = (-1)^j \left[\times(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}_j, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_n)\right].$$

The norm of the cross product then gives the $(n-1)$-volume of the parallelotope defined by those columns. (See, for example, Corollary 1.3 of [4]. If the columns are not independent, they define a zonotope of rank less than $n-1$ whose $(n-1)$-volume is 0.) Thus, the columns of $\wedge^{n-1}_{\pm}(A)$ are normal vectors to the parallelotopes that comprise the generating facets of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$, and the norms of the vectors give the $(n-1)$-volumes of those parallelotopes. (Note that from Corollary 1.8, each facet decomposes into such parallelotopes.)

We wish to examine from the perspective of zonotopes two classic results in the theory of convex polytopes. The first is due to Minkowski. (See, for example, [5]):

Theorem 3.3. *Given distinct unit vectors $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_t$ that span $\mathbb{R}^n$ and corresponding arbitrary positive real numbers $a_1, \ldots, a_t$, then up to translation, there exists a unique convex polytope $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for which the vectors are the outward-pointing normals to the facets and the numbers are the $(n-1)$-volumes of the facets, if and only if $\sum a_i \boldsymbol{u}_i = \boldsymbol{0}$.*

The second, due to Cauchy in $\mathbb{R}^3$, extended to arbitrary $\mathbb{R}^n$ by Alexandrov (see, for instance, [1]), and a basic part of geometric rigidity theory, is:

Theorem 3.4. *If combinatorially equivalent convex polytopes in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$, have congruent corresponding facets, then the polytopes are congruent.*

Considering first Minkowski's theorem, observe that for polytopes whose facets come in pairs with equal $(n-1)$-volumes and unit normal vectors that are negatives of each other, the condition $\sum a_i \boldsymbol{u}_i = \mathbf{0}$ is automatically satisfied. Indeed, it will turn out that given any distinct set of unit vectors spanning $\mathbb{R}^n$ and any corresponding set of positive reals, there exists a unique centrally-symmetric polytope whose pairs of opposite facets have the given unit vectors and their negatives as outward-pointing normals and the corresponding numbers as the common $(n-1)$-volumes of the pairs of facets. Thus, we have:

Proposition 3.5. *Given distinct unit vectors $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_t$ spanning $\mathbb{R}^n$, no two of which are negatives of each other, and corresponding arbitrary positive real numbers $a_1, \ldots, a_t$, there exists a unique, centrally-symmetric polytope $\mathcal{P}$ with $2t$ facets such that $\boldsymbol{u}_i$ and $-\boldsymbol{u}_i$ are outward-pointing normals to facets $\mathcal{F}_i$ and $\mathcal{F}_i^{op}$, and $\mathrm{vol}_{n-1}\mathcal{F}_i = \mathrm{vol}_{n-1}\mathcal{F}_i^{\mathrm{op}} = a_i$.*

Proof. The hypotheses ensure that the sum $\sum a_i \boldsymbol{u}_i + \sum a_i(-\boldsymbol{u}_i) = \mathbf{0}$ when taken over the $(n-1)$-volumes of all facets times their corresponding normal vectors. Theorem 3.3 therefore applies and guarantees existence of a unique convex polytope $\mathcal{P}$ with the given vectors and their negatives as normal vectors and the given numbers as $(n-1)$-volumes of t pairs of corresponding facets. The normal vectors come in opposite pairs, so opposite pairs of facets lie in parallel hyperplanes. The polytope is thus the intersection of the slabs that lie between these pairs of parallel hyperplanes. We need to show that $\mathcal{P}$ is centrally symmetric.

In order to bound a closed polytope, there must be at least n slabs. If there are exactly n given vectors, they form a basis for $\mathbb{R}^n$, and there are exactly n slabs. $\mathcal{P}$ is then necessarily a parallelotope and therefore centrally symmetric. Thus, the proposition holds for $t = n$.

Assume, by induction, that the proposition holds for all sets of $< m$ normal vectors and corresponding facet volumes for a fixed value, m. Now consider m unit normal vectors and m corresponding facet volumes $a_1, \ldots, a_m$. By Theorem 3.3, there exists a unique convex polytope $\mathcal{P}$ whose pairs of opposite facets satisfy the conditions of the proposition with these values. We wish to show that this polytope is centrally symmetric.

$\mathcal{P}$ is the intersection of another polytope $\mathcal{P}'$ and a specific slab bounded by hyperplanes $\mathcal{H}_m$ and $\mathcal{H}_{-m}$, which have outward-pointing normal vectors $\boldsymbol{u}_m$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_{-m}$. It is not clear, however, that $\mathcal{P}'$ satisfies the condition of the proposition requiring opposite facets to have equal $(n-1)$-dimensional volumes. (In the end, it will turn out that $\mathcal{P}'$ does satisfy all of the conditions and is, in fact, centrally symmetric.) To circumvent this difficulty, consider first an "intermediate" polytope $\mathcal{P}''$ that is the intersection of $\mathcal{P}'$ with the half-space defined by the hyperplane $\mathcal{H}_{-m}$ and its inward-pointing normal vector $-\boldsymbol{u}_{-m}$. In effect, $\mathcal{P}''$, which has one fewer facet than $\mathcal{P}$, is the polytope that results when the facet of $\mathcal{P}$ contained in hyperplane $\mathcal{H}_m$ is "removed". Compared with the remaining facets of $\mathcal{P}$, some of the corresponding facets of $\mathcal{P}''$ have larger $(n-1)$-dimensional volumes, while the rest of the facets remain the same. Altering the list of values given for the facet volumes of $\mathcal{P}$ by eliminating the last value, substituting the $(n-1)$-dimensional volumes of those facets from $\mathcal{P}''$ whose volumes increase compared to the corresponding facets of $\mathcal{P}$, and leaving the rest of the values unchanged, a new list of numbers, $b_1, \ldots, b_{m-1}$, is obtained. By the inductional assumption, there is a unique centrally symmetric polytope $\mathcal{P}'''$ satisfying the conditions of the proposition with

specified unit normal vectors $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_{m-1}$ and their opposites, and with corresponding pairs of facet volumes $b_1, \ldots, b_{m-1}$. Denote the center of $\mathcal{P}'''$ by $\boldsymbol{c}$.

$\mathcal{P}$ will equal the intersection of $\mathcal{P}'''$ with a particular slab bounded by hyperplanes $\mathcal{H}_m$ and $\mathcal{H}_{-m}$ whose outward-pointing normal vectors are $\boldsymbol{u}_m$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_{-m}$. All slabs are centally symmetric. If it can be demonstrated that this slab has $\boldsymbol{c}$ as a center, then $\mathcal{P}$ will be the intersection of two centrally symmetric sets with the same center and therefore will be centrally symmetric with respect to $\boldsymbol{c}$ by Lemma 1.1(f). To see that the slab bounded by $\mathcal{H}_m$ and $\mathcal{H}_{-m}$ is centrally symmetric with respect to $\boldsymbol{c}$, let $\mathcal{H}$ be the supporting hyperplane of $\mathcal{P}'''$ for which $\boldsymbol{u}_m$ is the outward-pointing normal, and let $\mathcal{H}'$ be the parallel supporting hyperplane on the opposite side of $\mathcal{P}'''$. The distance w between the hyperplanes is the width of $\mathcal{P}'''$ in the direction of $\boldsymbol{u}_m$. Let $\mathcal{H}_{tw}$ be the hyperplane parallel to and between $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}'$ whose distance from $\mathcal{H}$ is tw, where $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Define a non-negative real-valued function $C\colon[0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $C(t)$ is the $(n-1)$-dimensional cross-sectional volume of $\mathcal{P}''' \cap \mathcal{H}_{tw}$. As $\mathcal{P}'''$ is centrally symmetric, this function is unimodal and symmetric about the value $t = \frac{1}{2}$, where it attains its maximum. Moreover, the cross section at $t = \frac{1}{2}$ contains the center $\boldsymbol{c}$ of $\mathcal{P}'''$. (All of these follow from Corollary 2.2 of [2].) As a consequence, every slab bounded by hyperplanes of the form $\mathcal{H}_t$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1-t}$ will be centrally symmetric with respect to $\boldsymbol{c}$, and the intersection of each such slab with $\mathcal{P}'''$ will be a centrally symmetric polytope. In particular, this will be the case for the value $t = t_0$ where the $(n-1)$-dimensional cross-sectional volumes of $\mathcal{P}''' \cap \mathcal{H}_{t_0}$ and $\mathcal{P}''' \cap \mathcal{H}_{1-t_0}$ are both a_m, and where $\mathcal{H}_{t_0} = \mathcal{H}_m$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1-t_0} = \mathcal{H}_{-m}$. The values obtained for the $(n-1)$-dimensional volumes of facets of the intersection polytope that have non-empty intersections with $\mathcal{H}_{t_0}$ must agree with the corresponding facet volumes of $\mathcal{P}$ because these facets are formed exactly as facets of $\mathcal{P}$ had been formed by intersecting $\mathcal{P}'$ with a similar slab. It follows that all facet volumes agree with those of $\mathcal{P}$, and hence the intersection of $\mathcal{P}'''$ with the slab between $\mathcal{H}_{t_0}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1-t_0}$ is in fact $\mathcal{P}$, which is therefore seen to be centrally symmetric. (This also shows that $\mathcal{P}' = \mathcal{P}'''$ and that the slab whose intersection with $\mathcal{P}'$ produced $\mathcal{P}$ is the same as the slab between $\mathcal{H}_{t_0}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{1-t_0}$). □

Corollary 3.6. *If $\{\boldsymbol{u}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_n\}$ is a basis for $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ are arbitrary positive real numbers, then there exists a unique parallelotope with pairs of opposite facets having the $\boldsymbol{u}_i$'s as normal vectors and the a_i's as the $(n-1)$-volumes of the facets.*

Proof. The first step in the proof of the proposition included the observation that when the vectors $\{\boldsymbol{u}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_n\}$ were a basis for $\mathbb{R}^n$, the polytope uniquely determined by Minkowski's Theorem using the arbitrarily given $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ is bounded by n slabs and is necessarily a parallelotope. □

As a result, parallelotopes can also be found with arbitrary dihedral angles $0 < \theta < 2\pi$ and facet volumes. In the simple case of boxes, one might give high school students taking elementary algebra the problem of finding the dimensions of a box whose opposite pairs of faces have areas 1, 2, and 3, or, for that matter, any three arbitrarily picked positive areas.

We also note the following algebraic consequence of the preceding geometric corollary:

Corollary 3.7. *Every $n \times n$ non-singular real matrix, B, is the $(n-1)$-st exterior power of a unique $n \times n$ matrix. That is, $B = \wedge^{n-1}(A)$ for some $n \times n$ matrix A, which may be regarded as the $(n-1)$-st exterior root of B.*

Proof. Let B be an arbitrary non-singular $n \times n$ matrix. Regard the columns of B and their negatives as the normal vectors to pairs of facets of a parallelotope where the norms of these vectors are the corresponding facet-volumes. Recall from the discussion preceding Theorem

3.3 that for an $n \times n$ matrix A, the j-th column of $\wedge_{\pm}^{n-1}(A)$ is $(-1)^j\big[\times(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}_j, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_n)\big]$. This column vector is the outward normal for one of the pair of facets of the parallelotope $\mathcal{P}(A)$ whose corresponding generating facet is $\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}_j, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_n)$. The norm of the vector is the $(n-1)$-volume of this facet. The previous corollary guarantees existence of a unique parallelotope $\mathcal{P}(A)$ with specified outward-pointing normals and facet-volumes. Its defining matrix A, with perhaps the columns permuted and some of their signs changed, then satisfies $\wedge_{\pm}^{n-1}(A) = B$. If B is first altered to B' where the (i,j)-th entry of B' is $(-1)^{n+i+j}$ times the corresponding entry of B, then $\wedge^{n-1}(A) = B$. □

Conditions on matrices of various shapes that guarantee the existence of k-th exterior roots for different values of k are less known.

We now consider the Cauchy-Alexandrov Theorem for zonotopes, where a direct proof is possible.

Proposition 3.8. *If combinatorially equivalent zonotopes in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$, have congruent corresponding facets, then the zonotopes are congruent.*

Proof. Consider combinatorially equivalent zonotopes, $\mathcal{Z}(A')$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B')$, with respective defining matrices A' of shape $p \times k$ and B' of shape $q \times k'$. Suppose $p \leq q$. After replacing A' with QA' where Q is a $q \times p$ matrix with orthonormal columns, we may suppose, without loss of generality, that the zonotopes are embedded in the same Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^q$. Combinatorial equivalence means the zonotopes have the same face lattice structure, and hence both have facets of the same dimension (and therefore defining matrices of the same rank $n \leq p$), as well as the same number of edges (so that $k = k'$). As both are embedded in n-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^q$, we may assume that both reside within $\mathbb{R}^n$ and are defined by matrices A and B of rank n and shape $n \times k$. Thus, it suffices to consider combinatorially equivalent n-zonotopes $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B)$ with congruent corresponding facets contained in $\mathbb{R}^n$ whose respective defining matrices, A and B, are both of rank n and shape $n \times k$. We wish to show that these zonotopes are congruent to each other.

Consider first the case where $k = n$. The columns of both matrices are then independent and the zonotopes they define are parallelotopes. Corresponding generating facets of the parallelotopes are of the form $\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}_j, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_n)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{b}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\boldsymbol{b}}_j, \ldots, \boldsymbol{b}_n)$, which can be denoted briefly as $\mathcal{P}(A(\widehat{\jmath}))$ and $\mathcal{P}(B(\widehat{\jmath}))$. As the facets in each pair are congruent, Theorem 2.2 implies that $(A(\widehat{\jmath}))^T(A(\widehat{\jmath})) = (B(\widehat{\jmath}))^T(B(\widehat{\jmath}))$. Taken over all values $j = 1, \ldots n$, all columns of the matrices are covered by equivalent comparisons, and so $A^TA = B^TB$. (Indeed, it suffices to consider just three congruent pairs of corresponding facets in order to guarantee that all corresponding pairs of edges of the parallelotopes have been compared. This will be made explicit right after the end of the proof.) By Theorem 2.2, the parallelotopes are therefore congruent to each other.

The proof will be completed by induction. Assume the proposition holds for all pairs of n-zonotopes with congruent corresponding facets and defining matrices of shape $n \times j$ where $j < k$. Consider n-zonotopes $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B)$ with congruent corresponding facets and defining matrices of shape $n \times k$. Let $A(\widehat{k})$ and $B(\widehat{k})$ be the corresponding matrices with k-th columns omitted. It follows that $\mathcal{Z}(A) = \mathcal{Z}(A(\widehat{k})) \oplus l\boldsymbol{a}_k$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B) = \mathcal{Z}(B(\widehat{k})) \oplus l\boldsymbol{b}_k$ where $l\boldsymbol{a}_k$ and $l\boldsymbol{b}_k$ are the edges defined by the last columns. By the inductional assumption, $\mathcal{Z}(A(\widehat{k}))$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B(\widehat{k}))$ are congruent to each other, and as congruence extends downward to lower-dimensional faces, $l\boldsymbol{a}_k$ and $l\boldsymbol{b}_k$ are of equal length. Congruence of $\mathcal{Z}(A(\widehat{k}))$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B(\widehat{k}))$ implies that their visible surfaces in the respective directions defined by $\boldsymbol{a}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{b}_k$

are also congruent. Moreover, the argument given in the preceding paragraph guarantees congruence for every pair of corresponding parallelotopes that tile the zonotopes $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B)$. Consequently, the cups of cubes, $\mathcal{C}_{1,\ldots,k-1}(\boldsymbol{a}_k)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{1,\ldots,k-1}(\boldsymbol{b}_k)$ (defined in the comments following the proof of Proposition 3.2), are also congruent. As $\mathcal{Z}(A) = \mathcal{Z}(A(\widehat{k})) \cup \mathcal{C}_{1,\ldots,k-1}(\boldsymbol{a}_k)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B) = \mathcal{Z}(B(\widehat{k})) \cup \mathcal{C}_{1,\ldots,k-1}(\boldsymbol{b}_k)$, it follows that $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B)$ are congruent to each other. □

In the second paragraph of the proof, it was asserted that when three pairs of corresponding facets of combinatorially equivalent parallelotopes are congruent, then the parallelotopes are themselves congruent. In terms of comparisons of the defining matrices, this is the same as saying that if $(A(\widehat{j}))^T(A(\widehat{j})) = (B(\widehat{j}))^T(B(\widehat{j}))$ holds for three different index values, then $A^TA = B^TB$. To see this in more detail, observe that $A^TA = B^TB$ is equivalent to $(\boldsymbol{a}_i)^T(\boldsymbol{a}_j) = (\boldsymbol{b}_i)^T(\boldsymbol{b}_j)$ holding for every pair (i, j) with $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. If a pair of corresponding facets from $\mathcal{P}(A)$ and $\mathcal{P}(B)$ omit the edge defined by column i_0 of matrices A and B respectively, then congruence of these facets is equivalent to $(A(\widehat{i_0}))^T(A(\widehat{i_0})) = (B(\widehat{i_0}))^T(B(\widehat{i_0}))$, which in turn says that the comparisons $(\boldsymbol{a}_i)^T(\boldsymbol{a}_j) = (\boldsymbol{b}_i)^T(\boldsymbol{b}_j)$ hold for all i and j except for $(\boldsymbol{a}_{i_0})^T(\boldsymbol{a}_j) = (\boldsymbol{b}_{i_0})^T(\boldsymbol{b}_j)$ and $(\boldsymbol{a}_i)^T(\boldsymbol{a}_{i_0}) = (\boldsymbol{b}_i)^T(\boldsymbol{b}_{i_0})$. If a second pair of corresponding facets are congruent and omit the edge defined by column j_0, then the only omitted comparisons this time are those of the form $(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_0})^T(\boldsymbol{a}_j) = (\boldsymbol{b}_{j_0})^T(\boldsymbol{b}_j)$ and $(\boldsymbol{a}_i)^T(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_0}) = (\boldsymbol{b}_i)^T(\boldsymbol{b}_{j_0})$. If both pairs of facets are congruent, then taken together, the only missing comparisons are $(\boldsymbol{a}_{i_0})^T(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_0}) = (\boldsymbol{b}_{i_0})^T(\boldsymbol{b}_{j_0})$ and $(\boldsymbol{a}_{j_0})^T(\boldsymbol{a}_{i_0}) = (\boldsymbol{b}_{j_0})^T(\boldsymbol{b}_{i_0})$. Now, if a third pair of corresponding facets are congruent and omit a third edge defined by column k_0, then while some other comparisons might be missing from just this congruence, when taken together with the other congruences, the missing comparisons from the first two are now included as part of of the third congruence. As a result, all comparisons needed to establish $A^TA = B^TB$ are made when three different pairs of corresponding facets from the parallelotopes are congruent, so in that case, the parallelotopes will be congruent to each other.

It becomes less obvious and perhaps more surprising that congruence of three pairs of facets still suffices in dimensions much greater than 3. It should also be noted that requiring the dimension to be at least 3 is necessary in order to guarantee that comparison of shape matrices for three corresponding pairs of facets is sufficient to imply $A^TA = B^TB$. When $n = 2$,

$$(\boldsymbol{a}_1)^T(\boldsymbol{a}_1) = (\boldsymbol{b}_1)^T(\boldsymbol{b}_1) \quad \text{and} \quad (\boldsymbol{a}_2)^T(\boldsymbol{a}_2) = (\boldsymbol{b}_2)^T(\boldsymbol{b}_2)$$

do not force

$$[\boldsymbol{a}_1, \boldsymbol{a}_2]^T[\boldsymbol{a}_1, \boldsymbol{a}_2] = [\boldsymbol{b}_1, \boldsymbol{b}_2]^T[\boldsymbol{b}_1, \boldsymbol{b}_2]$$

because they lack the comparison $(\boldsymbol{a}_1)^T(\boldsymbol{a}_2) = (\boldsymbol{b}_1)^T(\boldsymbol{b}_2)$. Indeed, zonogons in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with congruent corresponding edges need not be congruent.

For combinatorially equivalent zonotopes, the uniqueness part of Minkowski's Theorem can be proven directly. Theorem 3.3 and its consequences will not be used, but Corollary 3.7, which has an independent algebraic proof, will be.

Proposition 3.9. *If combinatorially equivalent zonotopes $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B)$ have corresponding equal unit facet normals and facet volumes, then they are congruent.*

Proof. Let $A = [\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_k]$ and $B = [\boldsymbol{b}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{b}_k]$ be matrices of rank n with $k \geq n$, and suppose these matrices define combinatorially equivalent zonotopes $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The number of generating facets of each zonotope will be the number of maximal subsets of columns of rank $(n-1)$. That is, a generating facet will be defined by a subset of columns of

rank $(n-1)$ to which no further columns can be added without increasing the rank. (Each generating facet will produce two bounding facets of a zonotope.) The number of bounding facets will thus be some number $2m$ where $n \leq m \leq \binom{k}{n-1}$. We will be less interested in the bounding facets themselves than in the parallelotope constituents of those facets defined by choosing exactly $(n-1)$ corresponding columns from each defining matrix. While m unit vectors and their negatives will represent the outward-pointing normals of the bounding facets for each zonotope, repeating a normal vector for every parallelotope constituent of a bounding facet will produce a total number of $t := \binom{k}{n-1}$ normal vectors, $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_t$, along with their negatives, that will be used in the description of each zonotope. An equal number of non-negative numbers, $a_1, \ldots, a_t$, will represent the $(n-1)$-volumes of the corresponding pairs of parallelotope facet-constituents of each zonotope.

The proof is by induction on k. When $k = n$, the matrices are non-singular and define parallelotopes $\mathcal{P}(A)$ and $\mathcal{P}(B)$. Corresponding facets of the parallelotopes have the same normal vectors, so the dihedral angles between pairs of facets are also equal. Corresponding facets also have the same volumes. Taken together, these comparisons ensure that the defining matrices satisfy

$$(\wedge_{\pm}^{n-1} A)^T (\wedge_{\pm}^{n-1} A) = (\wedge_{\pm}^{n-1} B)^T (\wedge_{\pm}^{n-1} B),$$

and therefore also

$$(\wedge^{n-1} A)^T (\wedge^{n-1} A) = (\wedge^{n-1} B)^T (\wedge^{n-1} B).$$

Moreover, $(\wedge^{n-1} A)^T (\wedge^{n-1} A) = \wedge^{n-1}(A^T A)$, from which

$$\wedge^{n-1}(A^T A) = \wedge^{n-1}(B^T B).$$

Corollary 3.7 then implies

$$A^T A = B^T B,$$

so by Theorem 2.2, $\mathcal{P}(A)$ and $\mathcal{P}(B)$ are congruent.

Now assume the proposition holds for zonotopes defined by matrices with fewer than k columns for some fixed value $k > n$. Suppose $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B)$ satisfy the normal-vector and facet-volume conditions and are defined by $n \times k$ matrices. Let $A(\widehat{k})$ and $B(\widehat{k})$ be the corresponding matrices with k-th columns omitted. It follows that $\mathcal{Z}(A) = \mathcal{Z}(A(\widehat{k})) \oplus l\boldsymbol{a}_k$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B) = \mathcal{Z}(B(\widehat{k})) \oplus l\boldsymbol{b}_k$. The normal vector to each facet of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ belonging to the zone (that is, 1-zone) of facets containing $\boldsymbol{a}_k$ is orthogonal to $\boldsymbol{a}_k$. All of these vectors span a hyperplane orthogonal to $\boldsymbol{a}_k$. A similar relationship holds in $\mathcal{Z}(B)$. As the normal vectors and hyperplanes are the same, it follows that $\boldsymbol{a}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{b}_k$ are parallel. Moreover, corresponding facets in the zones for $\boldsymbol{a}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{b}_k$ have the same volumes. The facets in these zones are Minkowski sums of faces from either $A(\widehat{k})$ with $l\boldsymbol{a}_k$ or from $B(\widehat{k})$ with $l\boldsymbol{b}_k$, respectively. The faces are either $(n-2)$- or $(n-1)$-dimensional, and the resulting facets, after forming the sums, are then either prisms in the first case, or convex hulls of translated facets (when $\boldsymbol{a}_k$ or $\boldsymbol{b}_k$ lies in the hyperplane containing the facet) in the second case. In either case, congruence of the corresponding base faces, the fact that $\boldsymbol{a}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{b}_k$ are parallel, and equality of volumes of the resulting facets, force $\boldsymbol{a}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{b}_k$ to have the same length. Once the vectors are parallel and of the same length, the corresponding facets formed as Minkowski sums using these vectors are congruent. Thus, all corresponding pairs of facets from $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(B)$ are congruent, and the two zonotopes are themselves congruent by Proposition 3.8. □

REFERENCES

[1] A. D. Alexandrov, *Convex Polyhedra*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.

[2] D. Avis, et. al., *On the sectional area of convex polytopes*, Proceedings of the XII Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry, New York, 1996.

[3] A. Björner, et. al., *Oriented Matroids* (2nd ed.), Cambridge U. Press, New York, 1999.

[4] E. Gover and N. Krikorian, *Determinants and the volumes of parallelotopes and zonotopes*, Linear Algebra and its Applications, **433** (2010), 28–40.

[5] B. Grünbaum, *Convex Polytopes*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.

[6] R. Horn and I. Olkin, *When does $A^*A = B^*B$ and why does one want to know?* MAA Monthly, **103** (1996), 470–482.

[7] P. McMullen, *Polytopes with centrally symmetric faces*, Israel J. Math. **8** (1970), 194–196.

[8] P. McMullen, *Polytopes with centrally symmetric facets*, Israel J. Math. **23** (1976), 337–338.

[9] G. Shephard, *Polytopes with centrally symmetric faces*, Canadian J. Math. **19** (1967), 1206–1213.

[10] G. Shephard, *Combinatorial properties of associated zonotopes*, Canadian J. Math. **26** (1974), 302–321.

Eugene Gover
Department of Mathematics
Northeastern University
Boston, MA 02115, U.S.A.
e.gover@neu.edu